

**REMARKS**

In the non-final Office Action mailed on June 10, 2005, the Examiner: required corrected drawings; objected to the specification and the claims; rejected claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1-51 and 59-67 under 35 U.S.C. § 101; rejected claims 17-18, 22-25, 31, 33, 38, 42, 44, 49-50, 52, 54-55, 57-59, and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0120492 by Phillips et al. ("Phillips '492") and published U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0061179 by Reese ("Reese"); and rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Phillips '492, Reese, and published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0116348 by Phillips et al. ("Phillips '348"). By this response, applicants cancel claims 17, 18, 21-25, 31, 33, 38, 42, 44, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 57-59, and 64; and amend the specification, and claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, 19, 20, 26-30, 32, 34-37, 39, 43, 45-48, 51, 53, 56, 60-63, and 65-67. Accordingly, claims 1-16, 19, 20, 26-30, 32, 34-37, 39-41, 43, 45-48, 51, 53, 56, 60-63, and 65-67 are pending. For the reasons set forth below, applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner required new drawings, indicating that the informal drawings filed with the application are not of sufficient quality. On September 9, 2004, applicants filed formal drawings for this application. A copy of this submission, including the drawings, is enclosed herewith.

Applicants hereby amend page 2 of the specification and claim 44 to resolve the informalities therein that were objected to by the Examiner. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these objections.

Applicants herein amend claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, and 17 to resolve the basis for the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-51 and 59-67 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, indicating that these claims are not within the technological arts. While applicants do not agree that the contents of the preamble can be ignored for the purpose of determining whether a claim is within the technological arts, in order to expedite examination of the application, applicants herein amend the independent claims among those rejected to make absolutely clear that these claims are within the technological arts as required by 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 17-18, 21-25, 31, 33, 38, 42, 44, 49-50, 52, 54-55, 57-59, and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). While applicants do not concur in the propriety of these prior art rejections, in order to expedite examination of the application, they hereby cancel these claims, and amend any claims that formerly depended from these cancelled claims to make them independent. In view of these amendments, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and associated objection to claims that depend from rejected claims are moot.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully solicit a prompt notice of allowance. If the Examiner identifies any issues that would delay the allowance of this application, she is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (206) 359-6373.


Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 430558001US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Application No.: 10/811,077

Docket No.: 430558001US1

Dated: August 15, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Steven D. Lawrenz  
Registration No.: 37,376  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000  
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicants

Attachments